

From: canestro [canestro@mail.lifesci.ucsb.edu]

Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2005 10:48 PM

To: Melissa Miller-Henson

Subject: Comments on topics on the agenda for the 10-11 Jan BRTF meeting from SIG member

Melissa,

I am not sure who I am supposed to address my comments to as a SIG member. Below are my comments on topics on the agenda for the 10-11 Jan BRTF meeting. Please forward them. Thanks for your time.

Dear BRTF,

As a SIG member and University scientist/educator/reserve manager I have reviewed the "Proposed Outline of Information Required for Proposals for Alternative Networks of Marine Protected Areas" and the "Draft Criteria for Selecting the Central Coast Project Area" that are to be discussed at the January BRTF meeting. My comments are below.

"Proposed Outline of Information Required for Proposals for Alternative Networks of Marine Protected Areas"

These are well defined and comprehensive. The listed criteria should be weighted in the current order of listing.

"Draft Criteria for Selecting the Central Coast Project Area"

*Progress of past Department and other public discussion groups This is an important criteria and should include the rationale for F&G designation of its current Central Coast Management Areas, especially the Morro Bay South Central (Pt. Conception to Pt. Lopez) and Monterey South Central (Pt. Lopez to Pidgeon Pt.).

*Potential state, federal and private partners with financial or in-kind services This is an important criteria. Potential mitigation funds from power plants, oil companies and other industries impacting marine resources should be considered.

*Scientific knowledge of and research being conducted in the area *Availability of first-hand knowledge of the area Knowledge of the area is important for evaluating the impacts of designated protected areas. A lack of knowledge, may mean an area has been less impacted. Areas that have been impacted less by humans should increase their value as a protected area rather than reduce it. A lack of baseline data should not have negative implications when establishing a network of MPAs to conserve habitat Natural biogeographic boundaries should be considered under this criteria.

*Availability of scientific data on existing MPAs and how they meet or do not meet both resource protection needs and the requirements of the MLPA As current reserves are very small in size, not organized as a network, and monitoring of the sites has been haphazard there may be insufficient information to evaluate the reserves. Hopefully the current MLPA effort will change this in the near future.

*Existing fishery regulations in the area and how they meet or do not meet both resource protection needs and the requirements of the MLPA. Regulations are complex and will be challenging to sort out.

This is an important criteria. Duration of various regulations and potential to change must be considered.

*Range or area over which resources are utilized by user groups If this implies areas where resources are more heavily used are in more need of protection then this is an important criteria. If it is designed to avoid more heavily used areas then it does not meet the MLPA goals of habitat conservation, and should not be one of the criteria. This criteria needs clarification.

*Range or area over which a resource user may be expected to have a working knowledge of the resources. Once again if this implies areas where resources are more heavily used are in more need of protection then this is important. If it is designed to avoid more heavily used areas then it does not meet the MLPA goals of habitat conservation, and should not be one of the criteria. This criteria needs clarification.

*Distance members of a regional stakeholder group would need to travel in order to participate in group meetings With modern technology and the efforts put forth by the Blue Ribbon Task Force for effective communication, a show of numbers by stakeholders at meetings should not be a criteria. As described in the legislation MLPA designation should be based on the best available science not who can attend meetings and speak the loudest.

Thanks for your time.

--

Don Canestro Reserve Director
University of California Santa Barbara
Ken Norris Rancho Marino Reserve
393 Ardath Rd.
Cambria, CA 93428

805 927-6833 voice & fax
canestro@lifesci.ucsb.edu

On line project applications: <http://RanchoMarino.ucnrs.org/>

Overview: <http://www.californiacoastline.org> Images 1927-1938

Lat N 35 32.36/Lon 121 05.70 to Lat N 35 31.36/Lon 121 04.88